

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SHERMAN DIVISION**

BRUCE ALLAN ADES,

Plaintiff,

v.

BUREAU OF THE FISCAL SERVICE,  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:20-CV-00089-RWS**

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Bruce Allan Ades filed this lawsuit in which he now asserts a claim against the United States under the Federal Torts Claims Act. Docket No. 19 (First Amended Complaint). Ades moved for a preliminary injunction. Docket No. 13. The Magistrate Judge recommends denying Ades's motion. Docket No. 27 ("Report and Recommendation").


Because no objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report have been filed, neither party is entitled to de novo review by the District Judge of those findings, conclusions and recommendations, and except upon grounds of plain error, they are barred from appellate review of the unobjected-to factual findings and legal conclusions accepted and adopted by the District Court. 28 U.S.C § 636(b)(1)(C); *Douglass v. United Services Automobile Assoc.*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the motion and the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and agrees with the Report. *See United States v. Raddatz*, 447 U.S. 667, 683 (1980) ("[T]he statute permits the district court to give to the magistrate's proposed findings of fact and recommendations 'such weight as [their] merit commands and the sound discretion of the

judge warrants.’ ”) (quoting *Mathews v. Weber*, 23 U.S. 261, 275 (1976)). As such, the Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation as the findings and conclusions of the Court. It is therefore

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff Bruce Allan Ades’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Docket No. 13) is **DENIED**.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 6th day of November, 2020.**

  
ROBERT W. SCHROEDER III  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE